

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 46.—No. 2.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1823. [Price 1s.

TO
PARSON MALTHUS.

On the Population of England.

Kensington, April 10, 1823.

PARSON,

I ADDRESSED a letter to you, on this subject, in 1819. Since that time a *third* Population Return has been laid before Parliament. At that time very small was the chance of obtaining attention. The boroughmongers were yet gay. The consequences of the glorious war had not been so much felt as at present. I think, that, now, there is better chance of making some impression; and, at any rate, here is a *humbug* to be exposed; and, to expose it is a duty. The exposure will, at the least, serve to show the people of other countries how those of this boasting country are cajoled and duped.

There is an opinion existing, that the people of these islands

have, of late years, greatly increased in number. This is a singular thing upon the very face of it. *Why* should it be? There seems, as Mr. GODWIN says, "*no reason*" for such an opinion. But, it prevails, and to appear to doubt of the fact is likely to excite wonder amongst the greater part of companies. Yet, *why* should it be? *Why* should English people take, all at once, or, of late years, to breeding *more than formerly*? *Why* should they *die less* in proportion to the births? In short, *why* should they *increase in number*?

Never was such a thing suspected till you wrote your *book on population*. You found the boroughmongers greatly puzzled to account for the *increase of the paupers*; and you invented for their use this increase of population. It was plain enough that the people had been made paupers by the robberies committed on them by the means of paper-money; it was plain enough, that paper-money and taxes had pro-

duced the increase of paupers ; but this was not a pleasant thing to tell the boroughmongers, to please whom there must be some cause found out that cast no blame upon them. Hence your book, to prove, that *men increase faster than the means of feeding them*, unless there be some "restraint" on them, as to their *marrying and breeding*. This was a grand discovery for the boroughmongers ; and, it was still better, when you found out, that it was right to *check* this increase of population by *cutting off parish relief* ! This was delightful. What an excellent parson, to make such a humane discovery for the boroughmongers !

Your assertions were these : *first*, that there is a principle which is continually at work to cause an increase of population ; *second*, that it is necessary that this principle should be checked ; *third*, that in England it has not been checked, but, on the contrary, encouraged by the giving of parish relief to the poor ; *fourth*, that this encouragement was the cause of great evil to the country ; *fifth*, that it caused the paupers to increase in number and the poor rates to increase in amount ; *sixth*, that a law ought to be passed to prevent any relief

being given to people who should marry after such a day, or to the children proceeding from any marriage taking place after such a day. Here, however, I must take your own words. Those infamous words are these : "To this end I should propose a regulation to be made, declaring, that *no child* born from any marriage taking place after the expiration of a year from the date of the law ; and no illegitimate *child* from two years from the same date, should ever be entitled to parish assistance. After the public notice, which I have proposed, had been given, to the punishment of nature HE should be left ; the punishment of severe want : all parish assistance should be rigidly denied him. HE should be taught that the laws of nature had doomed him and *his family* to starve ; that HE had no claim on society for the smallest portion of food ; that if HE and *his family* were saved from suffering the utmost extremities of hunger, he would owe it to the pity of some kind benefactor, to whom HE ought to be bound by the strongest ties of gratitude."

I will not stop here to notice the unintelligible language of this

proposition. I shall remark upon that, perhaps, by-and-by. What I have here to do is, to show the falsehood of the assertions and the baseness of the propositions founded on those assertions. Mr. GODWIN gives you and your patrons credit for humanity of motive. I give you no such credit. Why am I to believe that your motives are not bad, when I find your doctrines false and your recommendations unjust and cruel?

The foundation of this mass of falsehood and cruelty is the assertion that the population of England has, of late years, *greatly increased*. I deny this fact; and I am sure you can produce nothing in proof of it, except those *Population Returns*, for the full value of which (when we have ascertained the value), I am quite willing to give you credit. Having asserted this increase of population, you next say, the population naturally will increase if not checked. Instead of being checked in England, it has been increased by poor rates. Let us, therefore, put an end to poor rates; and then comes the diabolical proposition above quoted.

I shall talk to you by-and-by about the *Law of Nature*; but first let us pursue this question of an increase of population. You

say that this population is increased by the poor rates. Can you tell me how it happens that it has not gone on increasing from the same cause, ever since the poor rates began to exist? Can you tell me that? Can you tell me why the poor rates should have begun to produce this effect only of late years? You can tell me no such a thing. You can give no reason why the increase should not have been going on from the time that the poor rates were first enacted. You can give no reason, why this increase should not have been regularly going on. In short, if it have been going on of late years, and going on from this cause, it must have *always* been going on; for before the poor rates were enacted, indigent persons were relieved by the parish priests and by the convents. If, therefore, to relieve the indigent be to cause an increase of population in the country, this increase must have been going on in England for upwards of seven hundred years! Now, what a pretty swarm, if your principle and if the *Population Returns*, if these returns and if your principle were worth a straw, what a pretty swarm we should be at this moment! The poor laws, themselves, have been going on upwards of two hundred years; and if, dur-

ing that time, your principle has been at work producing an increase, such as the Returns tell us has been produced during the last twenty years, there could not have been existing in all England above a *hundred or two pairs of breeders*, in the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth! The last Population Return must have fixed the thing in the mind of every man not resolved to be a dupe; but of this I shall have to say a great deal more by-and-by.

I before asked why there should be all of a sudden, such an increase of the English people. I do not ask what is the good of it, or what is the bad of it; but I here ask simply why it should be. There is no reason to be given for it, which will not equally well apply to every nation of Europe. We may as well pretend that the weather has grown better of late years, in England; but not in other countries of Europe. We may as well pretend this, as to pretend that your principle of population has been at work here, while it has not been at work amongst the continental nations. Upon the face of the thing, then, we should say, *this cannot be true*. There cannot have been an increase of people in all these countries at one and the same time.

They have been engaged in wars for thirty years past, and so have we. What in God's name should cause us all to have increased in numbers, during all these wars! What proof have we of any such increase? All the appearances are against such a presumption. Either the churches of this country were built for the purpose of standing empty; or, at least, those who built them, were most prodigal of their labour and their money; either this was the case; or this country was, at one time, much more populous, throughout the far greater part of it, than it now is.

No doubt Lancashire, part of Yorkshire, and some other parts, are more populous than they formerly were. No doubt this is the case with regard to the four counties joining up to the WEN. The last war drew together great swarms round the sea-ports. But, as to the *kingdom in general*, where are the marks of an increasing population? In a Return laid before Parliament in 1818, containing an account of the benefices and population, and also an account of the state of the churches and chapels. In this Return we find several churches, several scores and hundreds of good fat benefices, where there is now, in

some places, *scarcely any population at all*. And a great number of churches and of good fat livings, where the whole of the population, according to the Population Return, does not amount to *two hundred persons*. In many cases, the population does not amount to thirty. I have my eye now upon five parishes in Dorsetshire. They all stand following each other upon the list. *Almer*, population 160; *St. Andrew in Milbourne*, population 200; *Ashmore*, population 153; *Askerwell*, 197; *Athelhampton with Burleston*, 30; *Bittiscombe*, 70; each of these places has a church, each of them is a benefice. *Athelhampton with Burleston*, which contains only 30 people observe, has both a church and a chapel. So that, here are 810 people all taken together, and they have amongst them six churches and a chapel; that is to say, one place of worship for every 115 persons; and, of course, for about every forty or fifty grown up persons. Now, is it to be believed, Parson, that these churches were built for the use of a population like this? Is it to be believed that the churches were built solely for the purpose of finding out an easy life for the parsons that were to be put into them? It appears

that, according to their own confession, the livings of four of these parishes bring 600 pounds a-year. The worth of the two others is not mentioned; and they are not mentioned expressly because they are worth more than 150 pounds a-year each. Give these two livings 500 pounds a-year each, and then you have 1600 pounds a year given to parsons to take care of the souls of 810 men, women, and children. It is impossible to believe that such a thing ever was intended. No: these churches were built because there was a population that demanded churches. In the next column of the Return, there are the following parishes: *Buckland Ripers*, population 61; *Catherston*, 20; *Charborough*, 26; *Chilborough West*, 44; *Chilcombe*, 22; *Compton Abbas*, 40; *Farnham*, 56; *Hammoon*, 40; *Hinton Paver*, 26. Now, it is curious enough that these are all rectorial parishes, and that three of them are very large livings. Here are nine parishes, and nine parish churches for the sake of taking care of the souls of three hundred and thirty-five men, women, and children; so that here are only thirty-seven souls and a fraction to one parson. Just stepping into the next county, Wilts, we find the parish of *Bremhilltham* with a

population of 16; *Calloes*, 20; *Calstone*, 29; *Chalfield Magna*, 16; *Draycot Foliot*, 38; *Forley*, 45; *Langford Paver*, 20; *Pertwood*, 20; *Rollstone*, 39; *Sharn-cut*, 8. Here are ten parishes, all rectorial livings, except *Rollstone*, four of them are livings which, according to the Return, yield about 400 pounds a-year amongst them. But the other six are large livings. Let me explain this matter. The Return was to specify the value of no living that was ABOVE 150 pounds a-year! Why not? Why not specify the worth of those *above* as well as those *below* 150 pounds a-year? Why the reason was, to be sure, to keep from the knowledge of the public, the value of these rich livings.

To proceed, then, here are ten livings, worth, in all probability, more than four thousand pounds a year, to take care of the souls of 152 persons, amounting to about sixteen pounds per soul, per annum. It is monstrous to suppose that these parishes were founded and these churches built, without twenty times the population. In one of the parishes, *Draycot Foliot*, where the living is a large living, too, there is no church at all. The people if they go to church, go somewhere else, and

the parson still gets the money. In numerous instances there are no churches at all; but though the church is gone, and the people, too, the fat living remains.

It is impossible to look at these things, and not to see that one part of the nation has been depopulated to increase the population of another part. I have given the list of about twenty parishes here, which have become nearly depopulated. I could give a list of about four thousand parishes in England and Wales, for the present population of which, every man must be convinced that a church would never have been built. Churches, indeed, could not have been built by a population not exceeding that of the present day. How were 70 or 80 or 100 persons to build a church; one-half of them being females, to begin with, and two-thirds of the other half, being babies, boys or old men. How were churches to be built by a population like this? It is, therefore, manifest, that the agricultural population of the country has greatly decreased. There would have been no sense in building the churches; to have built them would have been downright brutal folly, if the population had not been beyond all measure greater than it is now, in the

villages throughout the greater part of the country.

When people see new houses, they are apt to think, that they see signs of increase; and this they certainly do see, where they see the *boundaries* of towns and cities extend themselves; where they see whole towns rising up here and there as round this WEN. But, to see new houses building in towns and villages is no sign of increase, any more than it is to see wheat stacks building in a farm yard. It is true, these are new stacks; but they only come to replace others that are just taken away. Houses are continually wearing out; and if, upon going through a town or a village, you do not see one new house; one house built this very year; one of these for every forty houses that the town or village contains; you may set down that town or village as being in a *state of decay*. In mere villages where the houses are weak, there ought to be *one new one out of every twenty*; for those frail houses do not last, upon an average, above twenty years.

Let any man take these observations for his guide; let him go through the country towns and villages; particularly those to the westward, once so populous. Let

him take notice of the tumbling down houses; of the totally dismantled small farm houses. Let him look at the little barns, and yards that were formerly homesteads, and that are now become mere cattle sheds. Let him look at that which was the farm house, but which is now become the miserable abode of two or three labourers and their families, who are perishing with hunger, cold and nakedness, beneath that roof where ease and happiness dwelt, until the accursed paper-money system laid its fangs upon the country. All these small farm houses have disappeared; and yet the villages have grown smaller and smaller. The accursed paper-money has drawn the wretched people into crowded masses. All the laws have had the same tendency. That mixture of agricultural with manufacturing pursuits, which was so favourable to the health and morals of the people and to their ease and comfort, at the same time; this is gone from the villages and country towns; and the population is gone along with it; and gone, too, to become a sort of slaves, regularly drilled to their work, and kept at it very nearly literally under the lash.

Accordingly, there is scarcely a village, at a distance from fund-

holders, manufacturing rendezvouses, watering-places, sea-ports, or barracks: there is scarcely a village at a distance from all these, which contains a *fourth part* of the people that it formerly contained. I have mentioned above twenty parishes by name. In most of these parishes, two or three farmers have come and swallowed up farms, formerly occupied by probably fifty farmers. Nothing is more common than to see a man occupying land, which formed, not more than thirty, forty, or fifty years ago, *twenty farms*. Three, four, or five farms made into one, is a thing to be seen everywhere. And yet, as I observed before, the population of the villages is decreased. In going through a village, in almost any part of the country, except where the funds or the manufacturing establishments have an influence, you are sure to see ten houses almost falling down, for every one that you see building. In numerous instances, I found, in my rides during the last fall, houses quitted, from the danger of their falling down; and I very seldom found that any new house was building in the stead. I went into scarcely any agricultural village, where I did not see the old bricks and other rubbish of a house or two, that had re-

cently stood upon the spot where the rubbish now was. On the outskirts of almost all the villages, you find still remaining, *small enclosures of land*, each of which has manifestly had its house formerly. They are generally in pasture at this time; but, if you look attentively at the ground, you will see unevennesses which show you that here are the relics of the foundations of houses; while, if you look at the fences you will see gooseberry, currant, or raspberry bushes, making their appearance here and there. In the middle of such little plots of ground, you frequently see old pear trees or apple trees, or the stumps of them remaining. All these are so many proofs of a greatly diminished, and of still diminishing population.

It is possible that as much human sustenance may be produced in these agricultural parishes as there used to be, though the number of hands may be much smaller. It is very well known, that horses and tackle now do, in many cases, what was formerly done by the hand of man. But, that there was more land in cultivation formerly than there is now, nobody can doubt. They produce to us the long list of enclosure bills; but it is curious enough that they never tell us,

that the far greater part of this land was cultivated formerly, without any enclosure bill at all. If the Parliament would lay out a few thousand pounds of our money, in order to ascertain how many hundreds of thousands of acres of land was in cultivation before the Revolution, more than is in cultivation now, I should not grudge that money, as I do the money laid out in Population Returns. However, the great proof; the *undeniable* proof, of depopulation, throughout a considerable part of the kingdom, is this fact; that there are nearly a third part of the whole of the churches, which, if the population were the same, when the churches were built that it is now, those churches were built by crazy people. They were built without any reason for building them. Many of them stand within a mile of each other; and it frequently happens, that the two parishes do not now contain people enough, allowing for sick people, and little children, and for those that must stay at home to take care of the house or of the cattle: it frequently happens that the two parishes do not, if you make these allowances, contain people enough to fill one pew! It is monstrous, then, to suppose that these parishes have not, in a great measure, been

depopulated. How are we to believe that people could have built churches unless there had been numbers sufficient to fill them? It is not in one two or three, but in *hundreds of instances*, that the churches are now *wholly gone*; and the people are left to straggle to the next parish church, while the parson, however, takes care to sack the amount of the benefice, notwithstanding the notorious fact, that, when tithes were founded, a fourth part of them was allotted to the building, the repairing and the beautifying of the churches. All this seems now to be forgotten. The churches are, in many cases, suffered to tumble down; the parson continues to pocket the amount of the tithes; and the paternal government brags of the increase of its family.

The *size*, the size of the churches; this alone would be enough to convince any man of sound judgment, that there has been a prodigious decrease in the population of a great part of the kingdom. The curious Return of which I have spoken above, professes to have in view to ascertain *how many people the several churches will hold*. So that, one naturally is inclined to look with a good deal of curiosity to what is said upon this subject, in cases

where the population is reduced to a mere nothing. Let us take a little list here. The parish of BREMHILLHAM contains sixteen persons altogether. The parish is a rectory. The parson is required to write down, "number of persons they can contain;" that is to say, number of persons the churches can contain. Now, this parson of BREMHILLHAM, states in his answer, that his church will contain "*the population*;" that is to say, his church is capable of holding sixteen persons, supposing the whole of the people of the parish to be at church at one time. Now, 16 grown up men can stand in a space four feet square. We know that six can sit in a stage coach; and yet this parson tells us, that his church, "can contain the population," of his parish. What, then, is there a *double meaning* here? Is there a little bit of the Jesuit played off among us sincere Protestants? The church can contain the population; but the pious pastor does not say that it can contain *no more*! But, this was not the question: the question was, *what number of persons they can contain*; that is to say, how many persons can your church contain? This is the amount of the question; and, notwithstanding this, it is stated, in this Return, that the

church can contain "*the population*," in the case of scores of parishes, where the population is *under forty*. Perhaps there is not a church in England, the porch of which would not hold twenty men. Certainly not one, the chancel of which would not hold a hundred men, standing upright; and, perhaps, there is not one that would not hold more than three hundred. We have seen above that there are eight people living in SHARNCUT, in the Return, the rector (for this is a rectorial living,) says that *his church can hold eight people*! And this he signs with his name; and it is sent by the bishop; and the bishop sends it to the King in council; and the King in council lays it before Parliament. So that, here is the Parliament informed, and here is the nation taxed to pay for the printing of the information, that there is a church at SHARNCUT in Wiltshire, that "*can contain*," eight living souls; a whole eight of them, at one and the same time. After this it must be a pretty beastly people to be guided by these Returns. The thing to remark with regard to this Return, is the cavalier-like impudence of it. It is manifest that the question was intended to get an account of what number each church

would contain, when it was sufficiently filled. There was no sense in the question if this was not the object of it; and, yet, here is a man to take his pen and write down the figure eight, against this question, and send it off to the bishop without any ceremony. In all probability his church would contain *several hundreds* of persons. I never yet saw a church that would not. It is very seldom, indeed, that the meanest and most miserable country church is less, in the clear than fifty feet long. Cut off a bit for a belfry and leave a piece for the communion table, and you have still a room thirty feet long, at least, and from fifteen to twenty feet wide. Two rows of people, sitting on benches up the middle of this room will make three score. There are about fifteen or sixteen pews generally in such a place. It must be a miserable hole that has not a gallery to contain a hundred. Add a few cross benches here and there. But, why need I make any such calculations, when it is notorious, that Methodist meeting houses, not a quarter part so big as the smallest church in the kingdom, contain two or three hundred persons each.

It is impossible, then, to believe any thing in these Returns, if the

facts stated make in favour of the parties. When they were compelled to state that the parish contained but *eight* people, and, in other cases, sixteen, twenty, thirty, forty, and so on. When they were putting down these numbers, it would have been awkward to say that the church was capable of containing *two or three hundred persons*; for, that would naturally lead the mind back, as my mind is now led back, to the question: *What were these churches built for?* Then I proceed to ask; What, in God's name were the tithes granted for, in cases like these? And, since the population is gone; since there are no souls to take care of; why are there benefices wherewith to maintain parsons? If our population be increasing too fast, why not check it amongst the breed of parsons? If the population be removed, so that the churches are not wanted in the places where they were built, and that churches are wanted in other places; if this be the case, *why tax the people for the building of new churches?* Why not take the amount of the tithes in those parishes where there are no churches now, or from which the population has departed, why not take the amount of these tithes, and expend them on the building

of these new churches, and in finding parsons for these new churches? At CATESBY in Northamptonshire, there are a hundred and seventeen people; the living is a rich vicarage; but there is neither church nor chapel. At STUTYBY in the same county, which is a rectorial living, which contains thirty-two people, there is neither church nor chapel. At HORNFIELD, and at MARTINSTHORP in Rutlandshire, there is neither church nor chapel. The former parish contains twenty-seven people, and the latter parish contains five people. But the livings are worth something. According to the confession of the parson himself the care of the five souls yields him sixty-six pounds a-year! That is to say, twelve pound, ten shillings per annum per soul! The parish of HASLEBURY in Wiltshire has written against it, as follows: "A rectory: a very small parish, two or three families. No church or chapel: the parishioners go to Box." This Box is an adjoining parish. But it is clear that they must go to the devil, if they had nothing for it but their own church. "*A very small parish,*" the parson says, but he does not say very small tithes. The amount of the tithes is *left blank*. That amount is, therefore, confessed to

be *above a hundred and fifty pounds a-year*; this is confessed by the sum being left blank; and it may be six or seven hundreds a-year, and very probably is.

Here, then, we have a pretty scene! Parishes in great numbers, without any churches at all, while the people are taxed to build new churches elsewhere; but while these rectors and vicars still retain all the tithes in the places where they have suffered the churches to tumble down. Nay, while this has been going on; while the churches have been tumbling down, and the parsons receiving the tithes at the same time; while two or three livings have been suffered to be possessed by one and the same parson, a hundred thousand pounds a-year have been voted out of the public money, *for the relief of the poor parsons of this church!* And never have you, PARSON MALTHUS, proposed to check the breeding of these parsons, or to *leave them* to the law of nature.

To return, for a moment, to the churches, Mr. WHITE, in his account of SELBORNE, observes, that the population of the parish must have been much greater formerly than it was when he wrote, because, says he, the church is now so much larger than is necessary to hold the

parishioners. I should stop here to express my acknowledgments to two gentlemen who have had the great goodness to send me a copy, each of them, of Mr. WHITE's book, which I have read with great attention, and in which I have found a great deal of entertainment. Mr. WHITE wrote in the year 1783 or thereabouts. He says that the parish must have been much more populous than it then was, seeing that the church was *much too large for the number of inhabitants*. He says, also, that the burying-ground was once larger than it is, or, rather, than it was when he wrote. He gives an account of six or seven mills having been, where there was no mill at all, at the time when he wrote. It is curious enough, that, in the Return, of which I have spoken above, which was sent by the bishops to the King in Council, and by the King in Council to the Parliament; in this Return it is stated, that the parish of SKLBORNE contains 770 persons; and that the church will contain, 560 persons! This is a droll affair! Here this half-depopulated village has not got a church big enough to hold its people; though, in 1788, Mr. WHITE, the vicar of the parish, said that the church was a great deal too big. Per-

haps, indeed, those who made out this Return, might, if you were to put it home to them, say that they meant the church would contain the 560 persons; but that they did not mean that it was not big enough for a parish of 770 persons, seeing that not one-half of the people are ever at church at one and the same time. However, we have, in this case, the *dimensions of the church*, which Mr. WHITE says, leaving out the chancel, is fifty-four feet long and forty-seven feet wide. He says there are three aisles, which, I suppose, are about each forty feet long. A double row seated up these aisles would hold about 240 persons. The area of the church is 2538 square feet. So that, supposing there to be neither gallery nor bench of any sort, here are three square feet and a quarter upon the pavement for every soul in the parish. And yet this Return says that the church will hold 560 people; and if the Return be not perfectly Jesuitical, it must mean that the church will hold no more than 560. Thus, then, we have seen what these Returns are worth; that is to say, we have seen, that they are never to be relied upon in any case, except where they tell against the wishes of the parties who make them.

The size of the churches is a thing of great consequence. We find them, throughout the agricultural part of the country, to be out of all reason too large. I have shown that there are many hundreds of parishes, the whole population of each of which, might be placed in the *porches* of the church. I have given instances of several parishes, the present population of each of which might be put into a stage coach. I have given instances, or, at least, have stated that there are hundreds and hundreds of parishes, the present population of each of which do not amount to a hundred; and that there are several thousands of parishes, the present population of which does not amount to two hundred. There were about ten thousand churches in England; and, at this very moment, the whole of the present population could, except in those parts where men have been drawn together by the paper-money, be not only accommodated with these churches; but, with the help of a little straw in each parish, actually hidden under the roofs of these churches.

Back I come then, after exhibiting all these very suspicious circumstances relative to these Clerical Returns; back I come

to enquire once more, what ground there can be for supposing that the population of England has increased. Here we have a whole list of parishes actually wasting away to nothing. This is a fact that it is impossible to deny; and yet you, and your patrons the boroughmongers, insist upon it that there is an increase of the population; and, what is more, a great part of the public believe you. This is one of those falsehoods that men tell till they believe it to be true themselves. There have been several of these great *national lies*. And there are several of them now indeed. They are *pieces of property* which the nation seems to claim as its own. An instance or two may not be amiss: because, at first blush, it appears monstrous to suppose that this population story is a lie. Yet it is a lie; and one that has great practical effect, too. It is at this moment assisting to complete the ruin of a great many farmers. They have read in the newspapers of the increased and increasing population of the country; and they take it for granted that the thing is so. Upon this ground they expect an increasing demand for their produce! "Only think of our increasing population!"—

This exclamation you hear from them in all parts of the country. So that this population-lie is a thing of great *practical effect*. It is just a thing to suit the present System: it answers the present purpose; and this system sets all consequences at nought.

It is of importance, therefore, to make a regular attack upon this great national lie; in the setting about of which, I will, as I said before, give an instance or two of other pieces of public property of the same sort. One of these is, that the late King made the twelve Judges independant of the Crown, by *giving up the power of turning them out at his pleasure*. This is a pure lie. He did no such thing. He did nothing to render them more independant than they were before. Whether they were rendered at all independant by the Act which gave them their places for life is more than I pretend to know. But, at any rate, that Act was passed in the reign of WILLIAM the Third, and not of GEORGE the Third; and the lie of which I have been speaking; this great national lie, was never heard of till about the time of PEG NICHOLSON and the pop-gun plot! It was hatched up at that time by the GIFFORDS and BOWLESES and

other anti-jacobin hacks of the day. I myself believed it to be true for a long while. One of these very hacks, talking to me about it in 1801, and perceiving that I was gulled as well as the mass of the people, put me right; and, when I expressed my *surprise*, he said, " 'Tis a feather: " Old William is dead; and we " have a right to take it, and stick " it into the cap of one that it " will do some good to." When I expressed my wonder at the *boldness* of sporting forth this lie, his answer was, the answer of the stock-jobbing press of the present day; " Who is there to " contradict us; who is there that " will dare contradict us?"

Another instance is this, that no Englishman can have his liberty or property taken away from him *without consent of his peers*. This is a lie of a great deal more importance than the last. This is a prime piece of national property. So great a lie is it as for its equal never to have been heard of amongst men. In all cases under the game laws (under which nearly seventeen hundred men get imprisoned in a year;) in all cases under the revenue laws; in all cases under the modern law of trespass; in all cases under the vagrant laws; in all cases under

the poor laws; in all cases under the militia laws; in all cases between servant and master, and especially where the master is Plaintiff: in all these cases; and in divers other cases, it happens, nine times out of ten, that the punished party, whether by fine, by imprisonment, by hard labour, by whipping; nine times out of ten it happens that the punishment takes place, *without the consent of a jury of any sort!* Yet, so grand a lie is this; so prime a piece of national property is it; so completely is it *part and parcel* of our THING which is the "envy of surrounding nations and admiration of the world;" so grand and so complete is this lie, that it is believed by ninety-nine hundredths of the people of England themselves.

Another great national lie was the reduction of the Debt by the Sinking Fund. That, however, has been greatly impaired in point of virtue. The *Bank Restriction* was another famous idea. The very word *restriction* itself. The bare invention of that one word was sufficient to immortalize the inventor. For nearly twenty years ninety-nine hundredths of this people believed that the cellars of the Bank were full of chests of gold; that the Bank wished to pay

this gold in exchange for its paper; and that the Bank was, very much against its will, *restrained* from doing this.

Now, after having cited these instances, may I not hope that people will attend to what I have to say about this surprising story of the population? You have greatly the advantage of me, Parson. He that has a lie to uphold, and a lie, too, that flatters the vanity of the people, has a decided advantage over his opponent. There has a taste grown up of late years amongst us; a strange taste *to be like the continental powers*: to be one of CASTLEREAGH'S great powers; to have whiskers as curled, spurs as long, swords as broad, rattletraps as noisy, and *population as great!* At the beginning of the French revolution, we very contentedly gave the French three persons for one, which we might do with great safety, because *one Englishman could beat three Frenchmen*. But, somehow or other, after the ever memorable retreat of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, we discover that there was not this difference in the individuals, when pitted against one another. One of the great maxims of our worthies, is that our *spirits*, as they call them, are always to be kept up; that is to

say, it is necessary always to keep us fed with some lie or other, to tickle our vanity, and make us patient, under expense, loss, and defeat. According to this maxim, the population story appears to have been trumped up. When the DUKE of YORK came home from the Helder, and left his army to be ransomed by the giving up of a great many thousands of French sailors, who were then our prisoners of war, the anti-jacobin hacks wrote a song, a bragging boasting song, ridiculing the French and the Dutch, and calling them cowards. This song was actually distributed and sung about the streets *by authority*. It represented the French as having been beaten, and welcomed the Duke home as a conquerer! This was only to keep up the spirits of the people; and the population lie has, doubtless, the same amiable purpose. The empty headed coxcombs, down yonder, talk about the "British Empire;" being an empire, it must, necessarily, have a good many people in it; and, therefore, we have been at work to swell ourselves out, till it is we, and not the French, according to the old song, that are *bursting like the frog in the fable*. In short, to cry up the population; to make the world believe, and

particularly to make the doped people of England believe, that there has, of late years, been a great increase of population in this kingdom, has been a point constantly laboured at; as constantly as to make them believe, that they were free, and that all other nations were slaves. Thus you hear the Courier newspaper, for instance, observing, with all the coolness imaginable, that it could wish with all its heart; such is its love of liberty; such is its innate love of liberty, that it could wish, with all its soul, to see the people of France *as free as the people of England are*; but that it knows too much of human nature to believe the French people *capable of enjoying so much liberty*! Next after the English, the modern English, come a part of the Americans, for cool impudence in this sort of way; and you frequently hear a prig from Virginia or Carolina, or Kentucky or Tennessee, who has, perhaps, let a negroe's guts about his heels half a dozen times: you very often hear one of these prigs observing, coolly as possible, that the French are not yet in a state *to be capable of enjoying liberty*! I never hear these prigs without thinking that that is a bad law that deprives me of the liberty of

breaking their necks: just twisting their heads off, as one would twist off a cabbage. Yet, this abominable impudence; this cool, this placid, this Quaker-like impudence, answers its purpose for *home use*, at any rate. At the present day it does not deceive the French people, the intelligent part of whom really entertain the opinions expressed in my last Register; but the impudence serves to keep up the cheat in England. It serves to make the people believe, and it does make them believe, that, at any rate, *the French are slaves!* It communicates that comfort to their kind souls; and it makes them like the Government for having restored the Bourbons which has made the French slaves. It is all a lie from the beginning to the end; but that is no matter: it serves to buoy up the **THING**; and that is all that is wanted.

After these instances, are we to believe in an *increase* of our population without any reason for such belief, and after all that we have seen above, tending to an opposite conclusion? There is no reason why there should have been an increase of population; and all the proof that we have on this subject, rests upon *three population returns*, laid before the

House of Commons, and published by the order of that House. According to these returns, the population, that is to say, the number of persons, in England alone, has increased since the year 1801, from 8,331,192, to 11,261,437 that is to say, to speak in round numbers, there has been an addition of *three* millions made; an addition of three millions to *eight* millions *in the course of twenty years!* A falsehood so monstrous as this; a lie so glaring, never, I believe, was put upon paper before. Out of what cause it arose, is not for me to say; but mind, here is a country which it is pretended, in these same Returns, did not contain quite five millions of people in the year 1700. Here is this country, which took a *hundred years* to make the five millions into eight millions; here is this same country making the *eight* millions into *eleven* millions, in the course of twenty years!!! Bang! Bang! Bang! Let the world produce us the like of this if it can. The country had, according to these return-makers, but five millions of people in it in 1700; and yet this same country actually *adds* to its numbers three millions in the course of the *last twenty years!* And, then, pray, credulous public, do observe, that

the numbers increase just as much in the last twenty years, as they increased during a hundred years before! But, *upon the face of the thing*: without going into any enquiry about it: without any argument or any fact, is it not monstrous to attempt to make us believe that a population of eight millions has swelled up to eleven millions in the course of twenty years, one half of which years have been years of *war*, and the other half years of *distress*, and, during the whole of which, there has been emigration going on from this country to the United States of America, and no emigration from other countries to this? Is not this a monstrous proposition? Is it a thing to be believed, though upon the oaths of fifty thousand return-makers? If we can believe this, we may believe that there may be a hundred millions of people in England in the course of a couple of centuries more. Indeed there must be, if this increase go on; and why it should not go on, if the present story be true, no man can give us a reason.

Then, if we *take a look back*, we shall find, that in 1600 there could have been only about a couple of million of people in the country; that a couple of hundred years before that there could

have been no people at all in the country, or, only two or three pairs turned down as breeders, at any rate; and then, how the devil *came the churches!* They were built *four hundred years before that*; and will you, PARSON, undertake to make us believe that the churches were built without there being any body to go to them; that they were built, too, without hands, and that they bred the people in their bellies; that they made the people, and that the people did not make them? Will you undertake to persuade us to this, Parson? Yet, this you must undertake and you must succeed in it, too, before you can make us believe, that England contained eight millions of people in 1801, and eleven millions of people in 1821.

Upon the face of the thing it is false. If a man were to come and tell you that all his mares had taken to have two foals at a time instead of one; or that they had taken to breed every nine months in place of every eleven months; you would not believe him the sooner for his swearing to it, or for his bringing an account of it upon paper signed by his bailiff and his carter. You would say: No, no, my friend: you are, doubtless, a very honest

fellow; but you and your people are all mad. Yet, your population story, is not a bit less incredible than would be this fellow's story about his mares. If we have been increasing at this rate, can you contrive to hatch a reason why the French *should not have increased at the same rate*? Not you indeed. I defy all the parsons that ever sucked down tithe-pig, to give us a reason for believing that the French have not been increasing as well as we. Seeing, therefore, that we have got from eight to eleven millions during the last twenty years, it follows, of course, that the French, who stood estimated at about thirty millions at the time that we had eight, must now have upwards of thirty-seven millions! The rest of the nations of Europe (unless you can show us a reason to the contrary), must have gone on augmenting their population at the same rate. Thus, then, Europe has received more than a fourth of addition to its population within the last twenty years; and it happens, that, just at the end of these twenty years our population-increasing Ministry are proclaiming, that, throughout the whole of Europe, there is an **OVER PRODUCTION OF HUMAN FOOD**; and that this

over production is so great, as to produce a series of calamities, which, in one particularly unhappy part of our own country, has led to *innumerable deaths by starvation!*

Again, therefore, I say, that, upon the face of it, the population story is false. You will say, "WHY; why should all these people make out false returns?" I do not say that they have all made out false returns. I do not charge any particular person with making false returns. I can see motives enough for swelling out the numbers: I see the old frog in the fable plain enough: but this is not my affair: my affair is the fact. There have been three Returns made out. I am about to prove that the first, or the second, **MUST BE FALSE**; and having shown that, I may, I think, laugh at the third?

The public will observe, that, prior to the year 1801, *there is no proof* pretended to be in existence. All before that time is matter of *estimate*; and those who have read the book of the thief catching Doctor COLQUHOUN, will be able to form a judgment of what sort of work, in a case like this, *estimating* is. In short, it is just what a man pleases to make it. He wants to come at a certain point.

If the basis of his estimate does not bring him to this point, he alters the basis; that is all. But, in the year 1801, we came to an *actual enumeration of the people*. Here there was no estimating. The querists were to go from house to house, they were to take an account of every man, woman, and child, and write it down. From each parish they were to send this account to the Government. Each account was to be signed by the parson, and by the parish officers. Now, then, here was truth, to be sure. In 1811, there came another Return; and, if there be any man in his senses, in England, to deny that one of these two contains a lie, England must contain a more profligately impudent wretch than any other country upon earth.

We are now going to see a piece of lying, which is a real curiosity. The reader will please to observe, that the two Returns were not made out in exactly the same form. The columns in the first Return, as far as they related to numbers of persons, stood thus:—

Persons chiefly employed in agriculture.

Persons chiefly employed in trade, manufactures, or handicraft.

All other persons, not comprised in the two preceding classes.

Total number of persons.

I beg the reader to pay attention to this; because, as he will soon see, the detection of this great national lie; of this grand, this superb humbug, turns, in a great measure, upon this distribution of persons. Between the year 1801 and the year 1811, I wrote several articles in the Register, upon the subject of the poor rates and the population. I combated you, Parson MALTHUS, by the means of this very Return of 1801. Here, said I, is cause enough for the sufferings of the labourers and the increase of the poor rates. But, stop: I am before my story. I must, before I go any further state the particulars of the Return of 1801.

Persons chiefly employed in Agriculture	1,524,227
Persons chiefly employed in Trade, Manufactures and Handicraft	1,782,531
All other Persons, not comprised in the two preceding classes	5,017,434
Total of Persons	8,331,192

Here, said I; here is quite enough to account for the misery of the labouring classes and for the increase of the poor rates. Here are five millions of idlers to three millions and a third of people doing work of any sort whatever! Here are five idlers to three and a third of working people. No

wonder that we see so much misery! And, then, I appeal to you, in the most pathetic strains. "Come, come, blessed PARSON MALTHUS, come! Come with thy check-population powers, and do put a stop to the breeding of these five millions of idlers, lest they, in the words of Holy Writ, swallow us up quick!" But you, PARSON MALTHUS, instead of listening to me, persevered in your project for diminishing the increase of the labourers; and that project went on till, at last, it came out in a sort of tapering dribble, from Lawyer SCARLETT.

However, this was a shocking picture to exhibit to the nation. It was really a horrible sight, to behold *five millions of idlers* sucking away the blood and sweat of three millions of industrious persons. Five drones to three bees was making it the devil of a hive to live in. That famous old lady the Bank of England had brought her family to a fine pass. At last, the time came for making out *another Return*; and now let us see how that Return was managed. Let us see, also, how it squared with the first Return.

A new mode of making out the Return was fallen upon. An increase of population we were to

have, of course! But, what we had to look at was to see whether the idlers *increased or decreased*. When the new Return came out in 1811, I was in great haste to get it; because, having taunted the System so many times with its *five millions of idlers*, I suspected, that the new Return would cause the number of idlers to diminish. With great eagerness, therefore, I twirled over the leaves of this Return as soon as I got it. Ah! the return-makers have been too cunning for me; or, at least, the new Return was calculated to *bother me*. I expected to find the Return made out in the same manner that it was made out before. There were before, agricultural persons, 1,524,227; trade, &c. 1,789,531; all others, 5,017,434. Very well, said I: now let us see, what the present numbers of persons compared with those of 1801. Oh, no! The new Return took care that I should not see this! It did not speak of persons, as before, but of FAMILIES! Why this change? What was it for? The answer will suggest itself to the reader in a minute.

The new Return stood thus:—

Families in Agriculture	997,353
Families in Trade, Manufactures, &c.	923,588
All other Families	391,470
Total of Persons	9,438,827

Here is a pretty change in the space of ten years! The idlers were five millions out of eight in 1801. Consequently the families of idlers would at that time have contained five in number for every three of both the other classes! Pray mark this. If the Return of 1801, had stated families instead of persons, there must have been five families of idlers, to three families and a third of the other classes. In short, something approaching towards *twice as many* families as the two other classes contained. But, what the devil do we find, PARSON, in this new Return? Why we find *more than five times* as many families in the two other classes as in this class of idlers! Ten years before there was but a *million and a half* of agricultural people, while there were five millions of idlers. But, in this new Return, there are almost *twice as many* families of the agricultural people as there are of those of the idlers! Ten years before there was only a *million and two thirds* of persons in trade, handicraft and manufacture; and there were five millions of idlers; but now behold, there are *nine hundred and twenty three thousand* families of trade and handicraft people; and only, so help me God, *three hundred*

and ninety one thousand some odd families of idlers!

Now, PARSON, *which* was the lie? Of these two Returns which was the lie, PARSON? To be sure, wonderful is the gullibility of this people; and, therefore, they may believe that both Returns were true; or, at least, there are some amongst them that may. But, before they can believe this, they must believe two things: not, that black is white and that white is black; but something a great deal more incredible than that. The increase of the population, during the ten years that we have just been speaking of, is stated at a *seventh*, a pretty good increase; but never mind that. The labouring classes, must, therefore, *as to number of persons*, have been, when the last Return was made, 3,787,029. So that, if the first Return was true, and the last Return also, there must, in 1811, have been, amongst the labouring and trading classes, only *two persons* and the third part of another person to *each family*! That is to say, only seven persons including *lodgers*, to *three families*!

Such a lie was never put in print, not even in a romance, on any other occasion in the world. The monstrous falseness; the prodigious impudence in this case,

puts an end, at once, to all arguing about the thing. One of these two Returns must be false. No one will deny that one of them is false. Which is the *most* false it would be very difficult to say; and yet, I believe, it must be a bold man indeed who would take upon him to say that the last Return is any truer than the falsest of these two.

I have now, I think, settled the point; not as to what the number of the people of England really is; for that would be very difficult to be guessed at, even to be guessed at, I say, by any of these things that have gone under the name of Returns. But I have settled the point, that the statements in these Returns are not worth a straw. If the two first Returns be true, then, in the year 1811, the persons in the families of labourers, journeymen, farmers, tradesmen, manufacturers and merchants: if those two Returns were true, the persons in a family of these classes, could, upon an average, not possibly amount to more than *two* and one-third of another, including lodgers! So, that, if those two Returns were true, there could have been no children at all amongst all these classes! Now, we know that this was not so. We know, then,

that one or the other or both of these Returns *must have been false*. We know that there was a great national lie somewhere in it. As one of those two Returns was a lie, what reason have we to suppose the *third to be true*, when its result is a statement at war with nature, with reason, with common sense; when, in fact, it inculcates belief in an impossibility? Upon the face of it, it is false. The more we reflect on it, the more we are convinced of its falsehood. Reason upon it forward or backward; adopt a belief in it; pursue that belief to its consequences; go upwards or downwards: and the conclusion is so monstrous as to make you blush at your credulity. If the second Return and the third Return be true, two more centuries must see the English people swarming like the lice in Egypt; and three centuries back (four centuries after the churches were built), there could have been only a single Adam and Eve turned down to breed! Upon the face of it, again and again I say, the thing is a lie. The Returns: these only have you to oppose to every thing like reason upon the subject; and one out of the first two of these I have proved to be a lie.

Thus, then, is the whole fabric

of delusion demolished. This great national lie will, doubtless, live for some time to come yet; but it has now got a blow. It will not be so successful as it was. It will continue to gull those who like to be gulled; but they are not of a great deal of consequence. I have given the lie a blow, in short, and, in the course of a twelvemonth, I shall have pretty nearly deprived it of its powers of delusion. This, however, is only the *first part* of what I have to address to you. Your doctrine of the *law of nature* is an interesting matter; and especially at this time, when between sixteen and seventeen hundred men in the course of a year, are put into prison for endeavouring to catch *wild animals*. No small part of these are sent to prison by *parsons*; and yet you, PARSON MALTHUS, are for leaving them to the *law of nature*; that is to say, you are for leaving them to the law of nature when they come to ask for relief. But you say nothing about leaving them to the law of nature when they are in the pursuit of hares, pheasants, and partridges. These matters, however, must be reserved for another occasion. My business, at present, was the demolition of the Population Lie, in which, at any rate, I have made a very good beginning.

WM. COBBETT.

AMERICAN APPLE GRAFFS.

Kensington, 11 April 1823.

I MENTIONED in a late Register that I had some American Graffs, coming by the canal from Liverpool. I have now got them, and, which will surprise every one who reads this, though cut from the trees in *December*, they are just as fresh, and the buds as full and as red as if they were this moment cut from the tree. I mentioned before, that I never had a cutting to die that I imported from America; but these I think, are finer than I ever had before. I have more than I want for myself. There are eight sorts: the DOMINA, the MATCHLESS, the VANDEVERE, the SPITZENBURG, the GOLDING, the ROAD ISLAND GREENING, the FALL PIPPIN, and the NEWTOWN PIPPIN. These I propose to dispose of in the following manner: I shall put three cuttings of the first, second, fourth, and sixth sorts; four cuttings of the third, fifth and seventh sorts; and eight cuttings of the eighth sort. This will make thirty-two cuttings; and these cuttings will, frequently, make sixty-four graffs. The price of a packet will be One

Pound. The cuttings will be done with hay, and with a piece of coarse cloth sewed over it. There will be a *number*, tied on to each sort, and a printed paper will be put into the parcel, with the names of the several apples, a description of their quality and time of keeping, and with a reference to the several numbers. The cuttings have all been taken off the tree with a *piece of the old wood to each*; so that, being in such an excellent state, they will keep good, if put into the ground, and in the shade, for *six weeks to come*. They ought to be laid in fresh dug ground, deep enough to cover the old wood, and to have the ground closely pressed about them.—I shall put into each packet a little of the seed of the *Broom Corn*; a little *Pumpkin* seed, a little *Canada Indian corn* seed, and a little *Melon* seed. I am very anxious that gentlemen should try the *Broom Corn*, in particular, being satisfied, that it would be a most valuable thing, for the making of *reed fences*, in gardens. In the printed paper, which I shall put into the packet, I will give directions for the cultivation of the corn.—As to the *Graffs*, they may be had any time after next Monday by application at 133 Fleet-street. They will be kept at Kensington;

but they can be got to Fleet-street, at any time, in about three hours' notice. If they are to be sent by coach, I request that the direction may be very plain and full.—A gentleman asks me, whether trees, on which these *grafts* are put, "*may be moved next March*." Yes; and *next November* very well. Many gentlemen wish to try these *grafts*, but have no *stocks*. They have *apple-trees*. *Espalier* apple-trees, or dwarf-standards, are the best things that can be for *grafting* on, in order to *get fruit quickly*. You do not *hurt* your tree by putting an additional sort on it. The American *grafts*, which I imported the *year before last*, and which now show for *bloom*, were put upon dwarf-standards in my garden. Gentlemen should be careful to make the *graffer* do his work *carefully*, and to see that the clay is put well on, and kept well on. And care must be taken to put *stakes* or *tie sticks* along, to steady the new shoots that come from the *grafts*, during the first summer. Of those which I put on the year before last, *I lost two thirds by the wind*. I was from home, and the effect of the wind on the new shoots, loaded with leaves, was not perceived soon enough. This precaution is particularly necessary, if you put the *grafts*

far from the ground, which exposes the new shoots to the wind. —The grafts will keep a month well. I did not begin grafting last year till the 3d of May. But, there ought to be no unnecessary delay; and, in the meanwhile, the grafts ought to be laid in the ground, in the shade, the old wood covered with the earth, and the earth pressed close about the wood. These American shoots appear very small; but, they are so well ripened and so sound, that, if put properly on a stock or tree that has fairly taken root, they are sure to grow. You may, if you will, graft with the old wood and leave one bud of the new. If there be blossom buds in your graft, you will have bloom this year, and may have fruit, if the graft be put on a good vigorous tree.

List of Grafts and Seeds in each Packet.

APPLE-GRAFTS.

1. DOMINA. A middle-sized Apple, deep red colour, a little flat shaped at the ends, very full of juice and good flavour, and keeps for a whole year if necessary.

2. MATCHLESS. Of a lemon-colour, large, clear skinned, rather pointed at the blossom end, very

fine flavour, but does not keep longer than Christmas.

3. VANDEVERE. Middle size, red skin, flesh deep yellow, form that of an orange, keeps till March very well.

4. SPITZENBERG. Middle size, bright red skin, inside tinged with pink, of a tartish flavour, excellent for pies, keeps till April.

5. GOLDING. Large size, rich yellow colour, very fine flavour, and keeps well till April.

6. RHODE ISLAND GREENING. Large size, heavy, close texture, green skin, yellow flesh, very fine flavour, and keeps well till March.

7. FALL-PIPPIN. Large size, sometimes weighs a pound, yellowish skin, yellow flesh, very fine flavour, and keeps till Christmas.

8. NEWTOWN PIPPIN. Large as the last, greenish mottled skin, yellow flesh, very fine flavour, and keeps well to the end of March.

SEEDS.

9. BROOM CORN. Sow first week in May; ground very rich; a drill two inches deep; seed thin along the drill; plants to remain at four inches a part; rows six feet a part; the ground well hoed during summer, and deeply hoed. The plants, if the ground be good, will grow ten feet high. The planter will see what beautiful

reed fences the stalks will make. This corn must have the full sun. If it be a *hot* summer, the stalks will produce stuff to make wisks of. I think this a most valuable plant to produce stuff for fences. Such a fence would last 20 years.

10. INDIAN CORN. Those who have once tasted it, always hanker after it. There are sorts which will not do well North of Maryland; and there are sorts which ripen a thousand miles to the North of that point. The seed put up is one of these sorts. The height of the plant, in *good* ground, is about *seven feet*. Sow first week in May. Rows four feet a part. Clumps (five seeds in each clump) four feet a part in the row. The clump about the size of a dinner-plate, and the seeds placed in clump at pretty equal distances. The ground well dug just before planting. Plenty of rich manure. *No shade*. When the corn comes up, *hoe* lightly about it. Soon afterwards *hoe* deep. Dig between the rows once or twice while the plants are growing. If a hot summer you are sure of a crop. When the *milk comes full and white* from squeezing the grain, you gather the ears, strip them of their covering, boil them in clear water for twenty minutes, rub butter over them,

sprinkle on a little salt, and then *gnaw* off the grain, holding the ear by the two ends. I never saw an English *woman*, who had not an *insurmountable* objection to do this; and I never saw one that did not *surmount* it before the end of the first three days of the corn-season.

11. PUMPKIN, such as they make pies of in America. Cultivated just like the main ground-crop of cucumbers.

12. WATER-MELON Seed.

13. GREEN-FLESHED MELON Seed. A friend of mine had as fine, of both sorts, last year, as I ever tasted. But, the last was a *real summer*. The seed will keep many years.

FOREST SEEDS.

I noticed in my last Register, that I had not examined these, to see whether they were good.—I find them good; and, if any gentlemen wish for an assortment, they may have them.—I really cannot fix on a price. It is *late* to venture on *Acorns*, *Chesnuts*, *Black Walnuts*, and the like. I am preparing for *sowing* all I have, because there is not *time* to get the seed about the country with safety; for, *at this time of the year*, it soon spoils. However,

this is what I will do : I will be prepared with some assortments at a Pound each (a dozen sorts of trees and shrubs;) and, if I get any orders they shall be sent; but, with this caution to the purchasers, that they sow the Acorns and Nuts without delay, and that they keep them in *cool sand*, till they sow them. Sow in drills three inches and a half deep.—A paper will be sent with the parcel, containing the names of the seeds, and also directions for sowing.—All the seeds, except the Acorns and Nuts will keep very well out of sand: in the same way, indeed, that wheat would.—Acorns and Nuts do not mind being out of ground *three or four* days, provided they come into careful hands *immediately afterwards*. But, they will not bear being treated like *dry seeds*.—The seed is certainly the cheap way of getting plantations; but, the seed must be *attended to*.

SURREY ASSIZES.

Kingston, April 1, 1823.

GAINSFORD v. SCOVELL.

Mr. COMYN opened the case by stating, that this was an action to recover the value of a certain quantity of butter and bacon,

which had come into the hands of the defendants as wharfingers, and which they had converted to their own use, &c.

Mr. Marryatt then addressed the jury for the plaintiff. The defendants Messrs. Scovell, he said, were merely nominally so. Messrs. Owen, Carroll, and Co. of Waterford, the shippers of the butter and bacon, having given them a guarantee. He then detailed the following circumstances, which were afterwards supported by the evidence of the witnesses: Carroll and Co. on the 25th Nov. last, shipped 100 firkins of butter and 25 bales of bacon, on board the *Friends*, Captain Elliott, on account of a cheesemonger of London, upon whom they drew for the amount agreeably to the terms of the contract made by their agent. The bill of lading and invoice for these goods were received by the cheesemonger on the 29th of the same month of November. On the 26th of the following month (December) he sold the butter and bacon in question to another cheesemonger, upon whom he drew, as is customary, for the amount at two months. About a week after, this cheesemonger placed the bill of lading in the hands of a broker, who, at his request, advanced him

330*l.* on the same, receiving at the same time, authority to sell or otherwise to dispose of the goods, to reimburse himself for the advance he had made. For this purpose the broker applied to the *plaintiff* who declined *buying*, but, at the request of the broker, agreed to make an advance upon the goods, upon having the bill of lading placed in his hands as a security. This transaction took place on the 8th of January, and the two cheesemongers having stopped payment on the 27th of January, at which time the ship had not arrived, the shippers of the goods, Owen Carroll and Co. determined to have the goods stopped, and for that purpose applied to the defendants Scovell.

Mr. Gurney, for the defendants, endeavoured to show that the plaintiff was aware of the insolvency of the cheesemonger to whom Carroll shipped the goods, and also of the other cheesemonger to whom they had been sold; but the only witness he produced, proved that the plaintiff had actually given credit to the cheesemonger to whom the broker made the advance, *subsequently* to the 8th of January. The learned gentleman said, that at most the plaintiff was not entitled to recover more than 298*l.* 5*s.* 4*d.* the

sum he had advanced; and he trusted the jury would think with him, that he was not entitled to a verdict at all.

Mr. Marryatt, in reply, said this was a case absolutely without any defence at all. The defence which his learned friend had endeavoured to set up, namely, a collusion between the parties, was proved to have no foundation. Nay, the only witness called by the defendants' counsel, had strengthened the plaintiff's case, As to the amount of damages, he differed entirely from his learned friend. Although the Plaintiff's claim may fall short of the value of the goods, yet he was entitled to recover the whole value, because he stood in the situation of a trustee for the surplus; the same as in a case of mortgage, where the advance had been short of the actual value of the estate.

Baron Richards said, that it appeared in evidence that Carroll had made a legal sale; that the person who purchased of Carroll had made a legal sale to another; that that other had parted with the bill of lading in a legal way to the broker, as a security for money advanced, and to whom he had given power to sell the goods; and that the broker had placed the bill of lading

in the hands of the plaintiff, who had actually advanced out of his own pocket the sum of 298*l.* 5*s.* 4*d.* The legal title, therefore, was clearly in the plaintiff; and if the jury were of opinion that all was fair and honest, as it appeared to him to be, they would then find their verdict for the plaintiff for the whole value of the goods, which appeared in evidence to be 336*l.* 18*s.* 10*d.*

Verdict for the plaintiff, 336*l.* 18*s.* 10*d.*

Messrs. Wilde, Rees & Peacock, attorneys for the plaintiff.

Mr. John Wilks, jun. for the defendants.

MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending 29th March.

Per Quarter.

	s.	d.
Wheat	50	4
Rye	30	4
Barley	33	1
Oats	21	3
Beans	29	8
Peas	33	3

Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.

Quantities and Prices of British Corn, &c. sold and delivered in this Market, during the week ended Saturday, 29th March.

Qr.	£.	s.	d.	Average,	s.	d.
Wheat .. 6,729 for 17,931	18	5	5	53	2	
Barley .. 3,339	5,817	8	5	34	10	
Oats .. 11,984	14,113	10	0	23	6	
Rye .. 19	41	12	0	28	8	
Beans .. 1,611	2,432	9	8	29	9	
Peas .. 794	1,387	15	1	34	11	

SMITHFIELD, Monday, April 7th.

Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	3	4	to	4 2
Mutton	3	10	—	4 4
Veal	4	6	—	5 6
Pork	3	0	—	4 4
Lamb	5	6	—	6 4

Beasts ... 2,759 | Sheep ... 16,950
Calves 153 | Pigs 240

NEWGATE (same day).

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	2	4	to	3 4
Mutton	2	8	—	3 8
Veal	2	8	—	4 8
Pork	2	8	—	4 8
Lamb	4	0	—	6 0

LEADENHALL (same day).

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	2	4	to	3 8
Mutton	2	10	—	3 8
Veal	3	4	—	4 8
Pork	2	8	—	4 4
Lamb	4	0	—	5 8

A fine ox, six years old, bred and fed by W. Holbech, Esq. of Farnborough, Warwickshire, was lately shown alive and dead at Banbury: he was got by a Durham bull, dam a buffalo cow; weight, 26 score 9 lbs. per quarter; hide 148 lbs.; rough fat 123 lbs.; roll 75 lbs.; height 6 ft. 4 in.; length from the shoulder-blade to the tail 7 ft. 6 in.; girth 9 ft. 10 in.; across the hips 3 ft. 1 in.; from the top of the shoulder to the briskets 5 ft. 4 in.; from the horn root to the tail 12 ft. 1 in.

City, 9 April, 1823.

BACON.

Since our last, some of the speculators became alarmed, and, by attempting to sell out, caused a temporary decline in price. They have rallied, however, and to-day

there is a good deal of briskness amongst those inclined to buy. There has been very little profit made by any one as yet; for those who have done the best, have lost as much by one half of their stock as they have made by the other; and we consider the average cost of all that is bought up to this time to be more than the present market price; so that an *advance* is naturally looked to as the means of making a profit.—On board 33s. to 34s. Landed 35s. to 36s.

BUTTER.

A good deal of Dutch is now coming in; and is all selling at a loss. There is very little demand for that which is not fine.—Carlow, 84s. to 86s.—Belfast, 80s. to 82s.—Dublin, or Waterford, 74s. to 76s.—Dutch, 84s. to 92s.

CHEESE.

This branch of trade is very dull, except for any thing of Superior quality. It is very difficult in the present state of things to quote prices.

There has been another trial on account of goods stopped *in transitu*, and in this instance also a verdict has been given for the plaintiff. This last decision seems to have convinced all parties, and, in consequence, several other actions have been settled without going into Court.

POTATOES.

SPITALFIELDS.—per Ton.

Ware.....	£ 3	0 to £ 4	10
Middlings.....	2	5 —	2 10
Chats.....	2	10 —	0 0
Common Red..	3	0 —	4 10
Onions..	0s. 0d.—0s. 0d.	per bush.	

BOROUGH.—per Ton.

Ware.....	£ 3	0 to £ 4	10
Middlings.....	2	0 —	2 5
Chats.....	1	15 —	2 0
Common Red..	3	0 —	3 10
Onions..	0s. 0d.—0s. 0d.	per bush.	

HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.—Hay....	60s. to 84s.
Straw...	52s. to 58s.
Clover...	80s. to 95s.

St. James's.—Hay.....	63s. to 84s.
Straw...	45s. to 60s.
Clover...	70s. to 86s.

Whitechapel.—Hay..	70s. to 84s.
Straw.	46s. to 58s.
Clover	75s. to 95s.

COAL MARKET, April 4.

Ships at Market. Ships sold. Price.

43½ Newcastle.. 38.. 32s. 6d. to 45s. 6d.

15 Sunderland. 15.. 37s. 6d.—40s. 0d.